UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,950	04/21/2004	Stephanie Parlamas	2003-0046	7206

26652 7590 03/13/2008

AT&T CORP.
ROOM 2A207
ONE AT&T WAY
BEDMINSTER, NJ 07921

EXAMINER	
CHEN, YI	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4152	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/13/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/828,950	PARLAMAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	YI CHEN	4152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-16* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *16 June 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *04/21/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-16 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1, 4, 7-9 and 14, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by as being unpatentable over Hardjono, (US 6,842,449 B2, thereinafter Hardjono).

4. Regarding claim 1, Hardjono discloses a signaling method for use in setting up internet protocol network calls, (abstract), wherein said internet protocol network comprises an application server, (location server with OCSP, col. 5, lines 9-11), for providing call feature processing, (step 815, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 40-55), said method comprising the steps of:

receiving at an application server call information whereby said application server is inserted into a signaling path for said call, (step 810, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 40-48);

determining, at said application server, whether said application server is required in the signaling path to complete call setup for said call, ("OCSP may return a status verification message to indicate whether the certificate is valid or not valid." If the certificate is valid, the location server with OSCP will remove itself. If the certificate is not valid, the setup will return to step 840. fig. 8, col. 10, lines 23-43); and

if said application server is not required in the signaling path to complete said call setup, said application server removing itself from the signaling path, ("OCSP may return a status verification message to indicate whether the certificate is valid or not valid." If the certificate is valid, the location server with OSCP will remove itself, fig. 8, col. 10, lines 23-43);

5. Regarding claim 8, Hardjono discloses a signaling method for use in setting up internet protocol network calls, (abstract), wherein said internet protocol network comprises an application server, (location server with OCSP, col. 5, lines 9-11), for providing call feature processing, (step 815, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 40-55), said method comprising the steps of:

receiving at an application server a request for call feature processing for a call whereby said request inserts said application server in a signaling path for call setup, (step 810, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 40-48);

said application server providing said call feature processing, (step 815, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 40-55); and

said application server removing itself from said signaling path upon a determination that it is no longer required in said signaling path for call setup, ("OCSP may return a status verification message to indicate whether the certificate is valid or not valid." If the certificate is valid, the location server with OSCP will remove itself, fig. 8, col. 10, lines 23-43);

6. Regarding claim 14, Hardjono discloses a network node, (location server with OCSP, col. 5, lines 9-11), for providing call feature processing, (step 815, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 40-55), during setup of internet protocol network calls, (abstract), said network node comprising of:

means for receiving call information, (step 810, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 40-48);

means for determining whether said network node is required in a signaling path to complete call setup for said call, ("OCSP may return a status verification message to indicate whether the certificate is valid or not valid." If the certificate is valid, the location server with OSCP will remove itself. If the certificate is not valid, the setup will return to step 840. fig. 8, col. 10, lines 23-43); and

means for said network node removing itself from the signaling path if is not required in the signaling path to complete said call setup, ("OCSP may return a status verification message to indicate whether the certificate is valid or not valid." If the certificate is valid, the location server with OSCP will remove itself, fig. 8, col. 10, lines 23-43);

7. Regarding claim 4, Hardjono discloses said determining step determines that said application server is required in said signaling path to complete call setup, said method further comprising the steps of:

said application server providing feature processing for said call, (step 815, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 40-55); and

said application server thereafter determining that it is not required in said signal path to complete call setup and removing itself from the call signaling path, ("OCSP may return a status verification message to indicate whether the certificate is valid or not valid." If the certificate is valid, the location server with OSCP will remove itself, fig. 8, col. 10, lines 23-43);

8. Regarding claims 7 and 9, Hardjono discloses said step of removing occurs prior to completion of call setup, (after the LS with OCSP remove itself, the system needs to go to step 850 and step 855 in order to complete the call setup, fig 8, col. 10, lines 9-22, col. 10, lines 29-32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2-3, 5-6 and 15-16, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Hardjono as applied to claims 1, 4 and14, in view of O'connor et al., (US 7,313,131 B2, thereinafter O'connor).

11. Regarding claims 2 and 15, Hardjono discloses said step of said application server removing itself from the call signaling path further comprises the step of:

transmitting an message to a call control element, (transmit a message from location sever with OCSP to SIP. Proxy server, step 825, step 830, step 865, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 50-59, col. 10, lines 23-30).

Hardjono doesn't explicitly disclose the message is SIP REDIRECT message.

O'connor discloses the message is SIP REDIRECT message, (col. 5, lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hardjono and the teachings of O'connor to create a system which can transmit the message more effective because SIP message contains additional information about the message.

12. Regarding claims 3 and 16, Hardjono discloses said step of said application server removing itself from the call signaling path further comprises the step of:

transmitting an message to a call control element, (transmit a message from location sever with OCSP to SIP. Proxy server, step 825, step 830, step 865, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 50-59, col. 10, lines 23-30).

Hardjono doesn't explicitly disclose the message is SIP REFER message.

O'connor discloses the message is SIP REFER message, (col. 2, lines 8-15)

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hardjono and the teachings of O'connor to create a system which can transmit the message more effective because SIP message contains additional information about the message.

13. Regarding claim 5, Hardjono discloses said step of said application server providing said feature processing further comprises the step of sending an INVITE message to a call control element, (step 825, step 830, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 50-59), in order to invoke service of another network server, ("called party", step 835, step 840, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 60-67, col. 10, lines 1-8), and

said step of said application server removing itself from the call signaling path further comprises the steps of sending to said call control element

a) an REFER message, (step 825, step 830, fig. 8, col. 9, lines 50-59), and

b) an cancel message to cancel said INVITE message, (cancel the step 830 after sending the "certificate is valid" message, step 860, fig. 8).

O'connor discloses the messages are SIP message, (col. 2, lines 8-15, col. 5, lines 4-7).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hardjono and the teachings of O'connor to create a system

which can transmit the message more effective because SIP message contains additional information about the message.

14. Regarding claim 6, Hardjono discloses another network server is a media server, ("called party", fig. 8, abstract), and wherein said invoked service is collection of caller input, (step 855, fig. 8, col. 10, lines 10-20).

15. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Hardjono as applied to claim 8 in view of Valentine et al., (US 6,327,267 B1, thereinafter Valentine).

16. Regarding claim 10, Hardjono doesn't disclose said step of providing said call feature processing further comprises the step of: determining a primary and alternate routing number for said call.

Valentine discloses said step of providing said call feature processing further comprises the step of:

determining a primary and alternate routing number for said call, (col. 5, lines 7-21);

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hardjono with the teachings of Valentine to create a system which can determine different routing numbers before the call is set up.

17. Regarding claim 11, Hardjono discloses said step of removing occurs immediately subsequent to said determining step, ("OCSP may return a status verification message to indicate whether the certificate is valid or not valid." If the certificate is valid, the location server with OSCP will remove itself, fig. 8, col. 10, lines 23-43);

18. Claims 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Hardjono as applied to claim 8 in view of Valentine and further in view of Fenton et al., (US 7,245,912 B1, thereinafter Fenton).

19. Regarding claim 12, Hardjono doesn't disclose said step of providing said call feature processing further comprises the steps of: determining a primary routing number for said call; sending said primary routing number to a network element; receiving an indication for an alternate routing number; and determining said alternate routing number.

Valentine discloses said step of providing said call feature processing further comprises the steps of:

determining a primary routing number for said call, (col. 5, lines 10-18);

receiving an indication, ("if the primary numbers is busy", col. 5, lines 17), for an alternate routing number, (col. 5, lines 17-21); and

determining said alternate routing number, (col. 5, lines 17-21);

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hardjono with the teachings of Valentine to create a system which can determine different routing numbers before the call is set up.

Hardjono and Valentine do not disclose sending said primary routing number to a network element.

Fenton discloses sending said primary routing number to a network element, (fig. 5, col. 5, lines 55-62);

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Hardjono and Valentine with the teachings of Fenton because the network element, (network exchange, col. 5, lines 61), can process the routing number of the call from the application server.

20. Regarding claim 13, Hardjono discloses said step of removing occurs immediately subsequent to said determining said alternate routing number, ("OCSP may return a status verification message to indicate whether the certificate is valid or not valid." If the certificate is valid, the location server with OSCP will remove itself, fig. 8, col. 10, lines 23-43);

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to YI CHEN whose telephone number is (571)270-3805. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nabil Elhady can be reached on 571-272-3963. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Yi Chen
2/29/2008

/Nabil El-Hady, Ph.D, M.B.A./
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4152